



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the close a clause on the value of baptism. (6) In the West R and its variations were known as the *regula fidei*, a term that is applied in the East only to Scripture. (7) Generally the symbol was regarded as a *sacramentum*, and hence an especially sacred character was attributed to it. (8) and (9) T assumed its present form in the West, through the general use of the Carolingian Psalters, in which it was inserted.

Of these conclusions all but (2) and (3) may be said to be all but universally accepted, and nearly all scholars accept (2). Of course, there are many questions of detail, which there is no space here even to mention, on which there would be much contention. What no scholar will do is to withhold his admiration for a work so comprehensive and exhaustive. It takes at once, and is likely long to hold, the place of the great monograph on the subject.

HENRY C. VEDDER.

CROZER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Chester, Pa.

THE APOSTLES' CREED. Its Origin, its Purpose, and its Historical Interpretation. A Lecture, with Critical Notes. By ARTHUR CUSHMAN MCGIFFERT. New York: Scribner, 1901. Pp. vi + 206. \$1.25, *net*.

MCGIFFERT ON THE APOSTLES' CREED. A Paper Read before the Lutheran Society for New Testament Study, New York. By JOHN A. W. HAAS. Philadelphia: Lutheran Church Review, 1902. Pp. 18.

DR. MCGIFFERT's work is always marked by careful, exact scholarship; and it is needless to say that these qualities distinguish every page of this book, which is not a popular homiletical treatise, but a historical study. The lecture is only a statement of main conclusions, the reasons for which are given in the critical notes occupying fully five-sixths of the whole treatise. Dr. McGiffert's conclusions are, in the main, as follows: The current Apostles' Creed is an enlargement of the old Roman Symbol, used in the Roman and adjacent churches in the fourth century. This Symbol was originally written in Greek, at Rome, about 150-75 A. D. Not known to Justin Martyr, it was well known to Irenæus and Tertullian. It originated in the desire to specially emphasize points of the common Christian faith, which were called in question by heretics, particularly Marcion. Its general outline was determined by the baptismal formula, which had then been long in use. The original text of the Roman Symbol was somewhat briefer

than the text current in the fourth century, since the temptation was always present to add expressions in view of current theological conflicts. Dr. McGiffert has thus entered into a controversy in which such men as Caspari, Kattenbusch, Harnack, Zahn, Swete, and Sanday have participated. On several important points he is bold enough to disagree with them all. As against Caspari, Zahn, and Sanday, Dr. McGiffert considers Rome the place where the old Roman Symbol was written. In this he is at one with Kattenbusch and Harnack. But altogether his own is his view that the Symbol was directed specifically against Marcion's views, and that it was unknown to Justin Martyr. This, in fact, is the author's main contention, and on this point he has expressed himself most fully and emphatically. We have sought to weigh his arguments carefully, and are compelled to say that we remain unconvinced. Each one of Dr. McGiffert's three questions (p. 173), viz.: (1) Why are so many essential elements of the church's faith at the time omitted? (2) Why are all the most offensive of Marcion's views opposed in the Symbol? and, (3) Why was the church compelled to use a Symbol *c.* 150-75 when it had not needed one before? may be answered satisfactorily without necessitating the acceptance of his view. In particular, the contention that up to about 150-75 A. D. the churches had no baptismal confession does not appear to rest on satisfactory evidence. It is the *argumentum e silentio* that is mainly depended upon, as in the author's appeal to the Didaché. Altogether, the evidence is of too uncertain value and too limited in quantity to justify Dr. McGiffert's most positive, unconditional statements.

Mr. Haas's paper is a severe and somewhat impatient criticism of Dr. McGiffert's main position. It is of value, notwithstanding its animosity, as pointing out the weakness of the evidence for the hypothesis that the creed was framed in opposition to Marcion's teachings, and as noting that the existence of numerous creedal formulæ in the East about and before 150 A. D. is of far greater significance than Dr. McGiffert allows. The author, as he himself admits, depends largely on the work of Kunze, *Glaubensregel, Heilige Schrift und Taufbekenntniss*.

EDWARD E. NOURSE.

BERLIN, CONN.